

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed January 9, 2007, the Office Action rejected claims 63, 65-80, 86-94 and 126-130 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1-42, 44-62, 95-125 and 131-132 have been withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 63, 65, 82, 86-87, 126 and 128-130 have been amended.

Applicants respectfully respond to this Office Action.

**I. Claim 64 is Allowed**

The Office Action has acknowledged that claim 64 is directed to allowable subject matter.

**II. Claims 82-85 Objected**

The Office Action objected to claims 82-85 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 82 has been rewritten in independent form and includes all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 82 be withdrawn.

Claims 83-85 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 82. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 83-85 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons presented above in accordance with claim 82.

**III. Claims 63, 65-80, 86-94 and 126-130 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office Action rejected claims 63, 65-80, 86-94 and 126-130 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,392,287 to Tiedeman, Jr. et al. (hereinafter, "Tiedeman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,396,537 to Schwendeman (hereinafter, "Schwendeman"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The M.P.E.P. states that

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one

of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.

The initial burden is on the examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done. To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.

M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims at issue are patentably distinct from the cited references. The cited references do not teach or suggest all of the limitations in these claims.

Claim 63 has been amended to recite “wherein the wireless communication system provides access to a decentralized data network.” Support for this amendment may be found in Applicants’ specification, for example, on page 7, line 4; page 10, lines 1-5. The prior art does disclose this claim element.

For example, Schwendeman discloses (as shown by Figure 1 of Schwendeman) “a communication system 100 utilizing a paging transmitter system 120, 122, 124, 126, for delivering messages to at least one portable remote unit.” Schwendeman, col. 2, lines 62-64. The communication system of Schwendeman does not teach, suggest or disclose a “wireless communication system [that] provides access to a decentralized data network.”

In fact, Figure 1 of Schwendeman shows that the communication system includes a central terminal. Regarding the central terminal, Schwendeman discloses “[t]he central terminal 102 has input sections 110 that interface with the telephone company equipment, such as the public switched telephone network (PSTN) 107.” Schwendeman, col. 3, lines 4-7. Interfacing with the PSTN does not teach, suggest or disclose “providing access to a decentralized data network” because a PSTN does not teach, suggest or disclose a “decentralized data network.” PSTN’s have a highly concentrated central switching structure for routing calls. See Applicants’

specification, page 4, lines 22-23. In contrast, a central switching structure is not needed for decentralized data networks. See Applicants' specification, page 5, lines 22-24.

In view of the forgoing, Applicants submit that claim 63 is patentably distinct from the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 63 be withdrawn.

Claim 65 has been amended in the same manner as claim 63. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 65 be withdrawn for the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 63.

The Office Action rejected claims 66-80 and 88-94 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Tiedeman in view of Schwendeman. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is well settled that if an independent claim is patentable over the cited art, then all claims depending from the independent claim are similarly patentable. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 ("If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious"). In this case claims 66-80 and 88-94 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 65. As noted above, claim 65 is patentable and nonobvious over the prior art. Accordingly, as the independent claim is patentable over the prior art, dependent claims 66-80 and 88-94 (which depend from independent claim 65) are similarly allowable. Favorable consideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action also rejected claims 86-87 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Tiedeman in view of Schwendeman. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 86-87 have been amended to depend directly from claim 82. Claim 82 has been rewritten in independent form in order to be placed in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 86-87 be withdrawn because claims 86-87 depend from allowable independent claim 82.

Claims 126 and 128-130 have been amended in the same manner as claim 63. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 126 and 128-130 be withdrawn for the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 63.

Claim 127 depends directly from claim 126. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 127 be withdrawn for the same reasons presented above in connection

with claim 126 because the prior art does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the claim elements of claim 126.

**REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 03/28/2007

By: /Kristine E. Ekwueme/  
Kristine U. Ekwueme, Reg. No. 56,344  
(858) 658-1901

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 651-4125  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502